

1. Election of Species

In response to requirement to elect one of the foregoing species, applicant hereby elects the species of FIG. 16 for prosecution in the present case.

In the October 16, 2007 Office action, the examiner indicated that no claims appear to be generic. However, applicant submits that independent claims do exist. For example, independent claims 1, 8 and 18 all appear to be generic claims. Accordingly, because generic claims exist, restriction of the claims should not be required

2. Identification of Claims Encompassing the Elected Species

In response to the examiner's requirement to identify the claims encompassing the elected species, **applicant hereby identifies the following claims as encompassing the elected species of FIG. 16:**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 27.

Conclusion

In the event the examiner has any questions concerning this response, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Favorable re-consideration and allowance of the claims of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Russ Fowler/

Russell E. Fowler II
Reg. No. 43,615

Please address correspondence to:

Paul J. Maginot
Maginot Moore & Beck, LLP
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5115

Telephone: (317) 638-2922
Facsimile: (317) 638-2139
Email: pjmaginot@maginot.com

Enclosure: Return Postcard